Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/720,970	REDING ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	HUY Q. PHAN	2617	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, aff al (with appeal fee) in complia	idavit, or other evidence, wance with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	Ivisory Action, or (2) the date set ter than SIX MONTHS from the n o). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN	nailing date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding am nortened statutory period for reply	ount of the fee. The appropria y originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e	e)), to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see v);	NOTE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	· •		
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed the following rejection on the following rejection of the following rejection on the following rejection of the following rejection on the following rejection of the following rejection on the following rejection of the following rejection on the following rejection of the following rejection of the following rejection on the following rejection of the following rejection of			
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4-6,8-16 and 18-22. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:] will not be entered, or b) 🛭		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the af	fidavit or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to oshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under a	appeal and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 			ce because:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☑ Other: Interview Summary and the new version of Claims		_	
	/Huy Q Phan/ Examiner, Art Unit 2	2617	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments, see REMARKS, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a) Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, and 22, which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, applicants argued that the instant specification (page 33, para. 97 and fig. 8) supports the limitation (as including new matter) of "forwarding calls intended for at least two of the communications devices to a second one of the communications devices in response to receipt of the indication and based on the user defined preferences" (see REMARK page 9). The examiner respectfully disagrees, since the instant specification merely discloses that "the user may select a check box 802 to forward all calls (initially directed by a calling party to any of the user's devices) to the users wireline office phone 602 whenever the users Bluetooth-enabled wireless phone comes within the vicinity (i.e., the range) of the user terminal 112_A, also located in the user's office... The user may also select a check box 806 to individually select the devices for which calls thereto are forwarded to their office phone)"; therefore, the instant specification does not clearly show "forwarding calls intended for at least two of the communications devices to a second one of the communications devices".
- b) Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, and 22, which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, applicants argued that "claim 1 clearly indicates that the calls recited in the claim 1 are not the same call" (see REMARK page 11). The examiner respectfully disagrees, since there is no indication that shows the limitation of "calls" is referring to the different calls being forwarded from two different communications devices. Therefore, it is unclear whether the limitation of "calls" is referring to the same calls being forwarded from two different communications devices (it is impossible for the same call being forwarded from at least two different communications devices to the particular communications device at the same "exactly" time); thus, making the claims indefinite.
- c) Regarding claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-16, and 18-22, which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), applicants argued that Holloway does not disclose "forwarding calls intended for at least two of the communications devices to a second one of the communications devices in response to receipt of the indication and based on the user defined preferences" (see REMARK pages 11-15). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Based on the claim language in view of the instant specification (see page 33, para. 97 and fig. 8), Holloway clearly discloses above limitation as described "When mobile phone 230 comes within the range of transmitter 220, mobile phone 230 receives the transmitted signal (step 310). In step 320, phone 230 sends an overhead message to cellular system 210 requesting forwarding of calls to preferred phone 240 (step 320) and passing on the appropriate phone number for forwarding".
- d) Regarding the rejection of claims 16 and 22, applicants argued that Holloway does not disclose "wherein the user defined preferences include a preference indicating that calls intended for at least the third communications device and a fourth communications device are to be forwarded to the first communications device when the first communications device is not within wireless communication range of second device". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Based on the claim language in view of the instant specification (see page 33, para. 97 and fig. 8), Holloway clearly discloses above limitation as described "When the user carries mobile phone 230 outside of the range of transmitter 220, mobile phone 230 recognizes that it is no longer receiving a signal from the low-powered transmitter (step 340). Mobile phone 230 then transmits a request to cellular system 210 on an overhead channel to remove the forwarding request (step 350)" see [0017]. The examiner interprets that if "calls" are no longer forwarding to other phones that means "calls" are directly forwarding to the mobile phone 230.

With all the reasons stated above, the rejection is deemed proper and still stands..